

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 129 and 144 - 189 are pending; claims 130 - 143 are withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, claims 1, 20 - 22, 144, and 148 are amended, and claims 2, 19, and 145 - 147 are cancelled. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

On page 2 the office action rejects claims 1 - 6, 22 - 30, 35 - 53, 64 - 77, 80, 86 - 95, 97 - 100, 104, 105, 108 - 111, 113 - 114, 117 - 129, 144 - 146, 149 - 163, 167 - 176, and 179 - 189 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,247,575 to Sprague (hereafter Sprague). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 4 the office action rejects claims 7 - 15, 19 - 21, 101, and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sprague in view of U.S. Patent 4,578,531 to Everhart (hereafter Everhart). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 5 the office action rejects claims 16 - 18, 31 - 34, 103, 106, 107, 112, 147, and 148 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sprague in view of U.S. Patent 4,405,829 to Rivest et al. (hereafter Rivest). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 6 the office action rejects claims 57 - 63, 78, 79, 81, 82, 116, and 164 - 166 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sprague in view of U.S. Patent 4,891,838 to Faber (hereafter Faber). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 7 the office action rejects claims 54 - 56, 83 - 85, 115, 117, and 178 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sprague in view of U.S. Patent 4,625,076 to Okamoto et al. (hereafter Okamoto). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 19

Claim 1 is amended by incorporating all the features of claims 2 and 19, and claims 2 and 19 are cancelled.

In its rejection of claim 1, the office action asserts that Sprague discloses all that is claimed. In its rejection of claim 19, the office action asserts that Sprague discloses what is claimed, except that Sprague “is silent on distributing the encryption key from a third party distribution system. However, the office action asserts that Everhart “teaches key distribution system wherein a central key distribution center distributes encryption/decryption keys to data sending and receiving sides” The office action concludes that it would have been obvious to combine Sprague and Everhart to suggest the invention recited in claim 19.

Sprague is directed to an information distribution system in which information packages (IPs) are encrypted for transmission to a user. Everhart is directed to a system that delivers cryptographic keys. Everhart’s system uses a key distribution center (KDC) in

conjunction with receiving terminals, wherein the KDC sends encryption/decryption keys to the terminals. Each secure session between the terminals requires a new "session key" for purposes of encryption and decryption. However, Sprague and Everhart, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest using a symmetric transaction key for encryption/decryption of an electronic book, comprising:

generating the transaction symmetric key at a first party location; encrypting the electronic book using the transaction symmetric key and a symmetric key encryption process; delivering the encrypted electronic book to a second party; encrypting the transaction symmetric key using a first shared symmetric key and a first symmetric key encryption process; delivering the encrypted transaction key to a third party; decrypting the encrypted transaction symmetric key using the first shared symmetric key and a first symmetric key decryption process; requesting the decrypted transaction symmetric key from the second party; encrypting the transaction symmetric key using a second shared symmetric key and a second symmetric key encryption process; delivering the encrypted transaction symmetric key to the third party; decrypting the encrypted transaction symmetric key using the second shared symmetric key and a second symmetric key decryption process; and decrypting the delivered electronic book using the decrypted transaction symmetric key

as recited in amended claim 1. In essence, the office action as ignored the many steps involved in encrypting/decrypting the electronic book and the encryption/decryption keys used with the electronic book. These many steps, as recited in amended claim 19, provide a level of security over and above anything possible with the combines systems of Sprague and Everhart. Because Sprague and Everhart, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the features of amended claim 1, amended claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 97

In its rejection of claim 97, the office action asserts that Sprague discloses "supplying an electronic book to be encrypted, supplying an encryption key, and encrypting the electronic book; and supplying the encrypted electronic book, supplying a decryption key, and decrypting the encrypted electronic book." Assuming, *arguendo*, the office action is correct, nowhere does Sprague disclose or suggest an electronic book viewer comprising a processor and a transmitter, "wherein the encryption information includes information that allows encryption and decryption of the electronic book and encryption and decryption of encryption and decryption keys," as recited in claim 97. Furthermore, the office action does not assert that Sprague discloses this feature of claim 97.

In contrast to Sprague, claim 97 recites "wherein the encryption information includes information that allows encryption and decryption of the electronic book and encryption and

decryption of encryption and decryption keys.” Since this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Sprague, claim 97 is patentable.

Claims 144 - 147

Claim 144 is amended to incorporate all the features of claims 145 - 147, and these claims are cancelled.

Considering claim 144, similar to its rejection of claim 97, the office action asserts that Sprague discloses “supplying an electronic book to be encrypted, supplying an encryption key, and encrypting the electronic book; and supplying the encrypted electronic book, supplying a decryption key, and decrypting the encrypted electronic book.”

Considering claim 147, the office action asserts that Sprague teaches encrypting and decrypting information packages using a symmetric key. However, claim 147 (now incorporated into claim 144) recites:

encrypting the transaction symmetric key using a first public key corresponding to a first home system; encrypting the transaction symmetric key using second and subsequent public keys corresponding to second and subsequent home systems, respectively; delivering the first through the subsequent encrypted transaction symmetric keys to the multiple home systems; decrypting the delivered first encrypted transaction symmetric key at the first home system using a first private key; decrypting the second and subsequent encrypted transaction symmetric keys at one or more of corresponding ones of the multiple home systems using second and subsequent private keys, respectively; and decrypting the delivered encrypted electronic book at one or more of the multiple home systems using the decrypted transaction symmetric key.

Nowhere do Sprague or Rivest disclose or suggest all of these features of claim 147 (and now of claim 144). Since claim 144, as amended by the incorporation of claim 147, recites features not disclosed or suggested by Sprague and Rivest, individually and in combination, claim 144 is patentable.

Dependent Claims

The many dependent claims all depend from one of the three patentable claims 1, 97, and 144, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, the dependent claims are also patentable.

Cancelled Claims

Claims 2, 19, and 145 - 147 are cancelled, and hence their rejection is moot.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1, 3 - 18, 20 - 129, 144, and 148 - 189 are patentable, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of these

claims. Following withdrawal of the claim rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the application will be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: October 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John K. Harrop", written over a horizontal line.

John K. Harrop
Registration No. 41,817
Andrews Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-3050
Fax (202) 662-2739